

**Appln No. 09/641,930**

**Amdt date April 7, 2004**

**Reply to Office action of January 7, 2004**

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10-15, 18, 20 and 22-36 are in the present application, of which claims 1, 2, 11, 23-25, 27 and 31 are independent. Claims 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 20 and 22-27 have been amended. Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 16, 17, 19 and 21 have been canceled without prejudice. New claims 31-36 have been added. Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2, 11-13, 23-25 and 27-30 are allowed/allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 14, 15, 18, 20, 22 and 26. Further, applicants request the consideration on the merits and allowance of newly added claims 31-36.

**I. Objection to Allowable Claims 11-13 and 23-25**

Claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form as required by the Examiner. Therefore, applicants request that the objection to claim 11 be withdrawn and that it be allowed. As the objection to claims 12 and 13 depended from the objection to claim 11, applicants request that the objection to claims 12-13 be withdrawn and that they be allowed as well.

Claims 23, 24 and 25 have been rewritten in independent form as required by the Examiner. Therefore, applicants request that the objection to claims 23, 24 and 25 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

**II. Objection to Allowable Claims 27-30**

Claims 27-30 have been objected to because of an alleged informality. Applicants have amended claim 27 as required by

Appln No. 09/641,930

Amdt date April 7, 2004

Reply to Office action of January 7, 2004

the Examiner. Claim 27 now recites, in a relevant portion, "aligns the plurality of SLICES to a suitable boundary in an external memory." The Office Action states "Claims 28-30 are objected to for the same reason as claim 27, by dependence." Hence, applicants believe that the objection to claims 28-30 have been addressed as well by amending claim 27. Therefore, applicants request that the objection to claims 27-30 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

### **III. Rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,923,385 ("Mills") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,228 ("McGee et al.").

In an exemplary embodiment of the present invention, a video transport processor includes means for generating a table of MPEG start codes to index the MPEG video data stored in the external memory. The table of MPEG start codes is used to access the MPEG video data in the external memory during decoding of the MPEG video data. Those skilled in the art would appreciate that the term "MPEG start code" has a particular meaning under the MPEG standard.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action states "Mills fails to disclose the means for storing MPEG video data in an external memory and means generating a table of MPEG start codes table to index and access the MPEG video data." However, the Office Action also states "McGee, in a similar art, teaches the means for storing MPEG video data . . . and means (205) for generating a table of MPEG start codes table (216, fig. 2A) to index and

**Appln No. 09/641,930**

**Amdt date April 7, 2004**

**Reply to Office action of January 7, 2004**

access the MPEG video data stored in the external memory during decoding of the MPEG video data."

The Office Action cites col. 2, lines 1-4, col. 4, lines 36-47 and col. 15, lines 27-39 of McGee et al. to support the rejection. Applicants do not see, however, any reference to MPEG start codes or to an MPEG start code table in the sections cited in the Office Action. By way of example, McGee et al. recites "it is an object of the invention to provide a system which will create a visual index for . . . selecting significant keyframes by varying the number of keyframes chosen from a video based on the category of the video." (Emphasis Added, Col. 1, lines 61-66). McGee et al. further recites "[t]he present invention further presents a video analysis system supporting visual content extraction for source video which may include informative and/or entertainment programs such as news, serials, weather, sports or any type of home recorded video, broadcast material, prerecorded material, etc." (Col. 2, lines 1-6). Hence, McGee et al. appears to disclose an indexing system based on content or category of the video, and not based on the MPEG start codes. Further, applicants do not see anywhere in McGee et al. any disclosure that the video indices used are MPEG start codes.

Claim 1 recites, in a relevant portion, "means for generating a table of MPEG start codes to index the MPEG video data stored in the external memory, wherein said table of MPEG start codes is used to access the MPEG video data in the external memory during decoding of the MPEG video data." Since Mills and McGee et al. do not teach or suggest such means for

**Appln No. 09/641,930**

**Amdt date April 7, 2004**

**Reply to Office action of January 7, 2004**

generating a table of MPEG start codes, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn and that it be allowed.

**IV. Rejection of Claims 3-4, 6-7, 16, 18 and 19 under 35 U.S.C.**

**§ 102(e)**

Claims 3-4, 6-7 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,459,456 ("Oh"). Claims 3-4, 6-7 and 16 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,467,093 ("Inoue et al."). Further, claims 18 and 19 have been rejected under the same rationale as claims 6 and 7, respectively. Since claims 3, 7, 16 and 19 have been canceled herein, their rejection is now moot.

Since claims 4 and 6 depend from claim 11, they incorporate all the terms and limitations of claim 11 in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claims 4 and 6 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

Since claim 18 depends from claim 23, it incorporates all the terms and limitations of claim 23 in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish it over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claim 18 be withdrawn and that it be allowed.

Appln No. 09/641,930

Amdt date April 7, 2004

Reply to Office action of January 7, 2004

**V. Rejection of Claims 5, 9, 17 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 5, 9, 17 and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oh or Inoue in view of McGee et al. Since claims 5, 9, 17 and 21 have been ~~rejected~~ <sup>canceled</sup> herein, their rejection is now moot.

**VI. Rejection of claims 10 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 10 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oh or Inoue in view of McGee et al., as applied to claims 3, 5 and 9, and further in view of Mills. Since claims 10 and 22 depend from claims 11 and 23, respectively, they include all the terms and limitations of the respective base claim, in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claims 10 and 22 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

**VII. Rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oh or Inoue in view of Auld. Since claim 15 depends from claim 11, it incorporates all the terms and limitations of claim 11 in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish it over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claim 15 be withdrawn and that it be allowed.

Appln No. 09/641,930

Amdt date April 7, 2004

Reply to Office action of January 7, 2004

**VIII. Rejection of claims 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 8 and 20 have been rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oh or Inoue in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,124,878 ("Adams"). Since claims 8 and 20 depend from claims 11 and 23, respectively, they incorporate all the terms and limitations of the respective base claim in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claims 8 and 20 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

**IX. Rejection of claims 14 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 14 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Oh or Inoue in view of McGee et al., as applied to claims 5 and 9, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,357,045 ("Devaney"). Since claims 14 and 26 depend from claims 11 and 23, respectively, they incorporate all the terms and limitations of the respective base claim in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claims 14 and 26 be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

**X. New Claims 31-36**

Claim 31 recites, in a relevant portion, "[a] video transport processor comprising . . . a start code alignment module for storing the MPEG video data in an external memory, for aligning a start of the plurality of SLICES to a suitable

Appln No. 09/641,930

Amdt date April 7, 2004

Reply to Office action of January 7, 2004


boundary in the external memory when storing the MPEG video data in the external memory, and for generating a start code table to index the MPEG video data stored in the external memory."

(Emphasis Added) Since the cited references do not teach or suggest such video transport processor, applicants request that claim 31 be allowed. Since claims 32-36 depend from claim 31, they incorporate all the terms and limitations of claim 31 in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that claims 32-36 be allowed.

#### XI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants believe that the application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, applicants request an early issuance of a patent with claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10-15, 18, 20 and 22-36. If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By   
Jun-Young E. Jeon  
Reg. No. 43,693  
626/795-9900

JEJ/jej

JEJ PAS559351.1-\*04/7/04 8:47 AM